

Manuscript: “**Typologie De La Pêche Et Production De Synodontis Membranaceus (Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1809) Au Niveau De La Rivière Bagoué (Côte d’Ivoire)**”

Submitted: 01 May 2021

Accepted: 29 May 2021

Published: 30 June 2021

Corresponding Author: Kassoum Kouyate

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p150

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Serigne Modou Sarr, Université Alioune DIOP de Bambey, Senegal

Reviewer 2: Mamadou Ndiaye, Direction des Aires Marines Communautaires Protégées, Dakar, Sénégal

Reviewer 3: Sanogo Souleymane, Université Nazi Boni, Laboratoire de Recherche et de Formation en Pêche et Faune (LaRFPP), BoboDioulasso, Burkina Faso

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Serigne Modou SARR	Email:
University/Country: Université Alioune Diop de Bambey, Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/05/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/05/2021
Manuscript Title: Typologie de la pêche dans la rivière Bagoué (Côte d’Ivoire) et production de <i>Synodontis membranaceus</i> Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1809	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0522/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu du manuscrit	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

Le résumé est clair et a présenté les objectifs , la méthodologie et les résultats	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Le texte est facile à lire avec moins de fautes grammaticale et de mots sautés	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>La méthodologie est claire avec les parties matériel et méthode bien explicitées</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les résultats sont clairs et conformes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Cette partie est bien rédigée	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Les références sont suffisantes, actualisées et appropriées par rapport au texte	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'auteur doit apporter les corrections mineures

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title of the article fits perfectly with the content of the document

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Well done summary with a well detailed objective, methodology and results

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Almost no particular grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Apart from the selectivity of the different gears, which seemed to me relevant to be mentioned, the rest was well addressed

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Very clear

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion and the summary are perfectly focused on the content

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Here too, everything seems coherent. All references quoted are in adequacy with the approached subject. However, there may be references cited that are not present in the document, and vice versa. What I could not detect.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Consider the few comments on the document

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

I propose :

Typologie de la pêche et production de *Synodontis membranaceus* (Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1809) au niveau de la rivière Bagoué (Côte d'Ivoire)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

ok

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

minimal errors

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

ok

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

minimal errors

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The recommendations are on the manuscript